

M2262
Sunday, May 27, 1973
Land
Evening meeting

Mr. Nyland: So, our ... our very last meeting tonight. Tomorrow by this time I hope to be back in Warwick. There are a few things that I believe I might, uh, mention first, and then we can have questions and answers and whatever ... whatever you like. Sounds wonderful, doesn't it.

We talked about San Francisco. I'd like San Francisco to become much stronger than it is as—how would we like to call it—the 'demonstration Group' in the midst of the different Groups that exist here and there interested in esoteric knowledge, and sometimes quite definitely about Gurdjieff, that there is something that I feel is *pure* Gurdjieff. I can't help having that fear. Because I think for years and years we've tried actually to talk about the ideas of Gurdjieff in as exact a language as we know, based entirely on All and Everything and whatever Gurdjieff has written and whatever I happen to remember about him. I do not know to what extent there are sometimes interpretations a little, and also examples which may come from my own experience, but I think in general it is quite clear what is meant by Objectivity, and we have explained it several times—what is really meant by Work on oneself. I think it is necessary that here and there such Groups exist, and that is one of the aims for me of going around and being present at some of such meetings and to keep in contact with the meetings by means of cassettes. So, I feel that San Francisco has to have a very good Group.

I would like to change the Nucleus and I will, before I go, definitely make a suggestion, which I don't want to do right now, as yet, because I would like to talk about it still. But, what do I expect really such a Nucleus to do. And the same holds true also for Sebastopol: A Nucleus must consist of people who know Work so that whatever question in simplicity of application exists, that the answer is correct. That there is no maybe about it. That there is no particular personal interpretation unless that happens to be indicated, and that examples that might be given

can be based on one's own experience, which must be truthful. Again I say, then it has to be in exact language. And I would like to help you with that, because it has not always been that way; so that whenever there is a cassette of ... of that nature that you want to send to Warwick, I will personally try to listen to it. If I cannot, I will ask some of the people there to do it, the purpose being that they will listen very carefully to the answers of those who have answered. So that then in a ... in an answer cassette we will only make reference to the answers themselves. It's not going to be a cassette that will be played at the next meeting because it is of no concern to the rest of the Group, but it is definitely of concern for those who belong to that Nucleus so that they then understand what we think their answers are worth.

I hope you understand the reason why I do it, and I hope you don't mind it. Because it is a question of cooperation and to make sure that we really are trying to say the same thing. We will try to make it as free from interpretation on our part as possible, and if there is any further disagreement—if we, for instance, would say that so-and-so did not hit the particular aim or was not entirely clear—when you do not agree that you then take the trouble of telling us so that we can straighten it out. That little tape that might come back I would like to have listened to by the Nucleus only, or at least those who have answered that particular meeting. I think in that way we can work much, much better together, and we will have a chance of really getting questions and answers correct ... correctly placed.

I think you know that I have changed in Warwick also the question of the New York meeting, so that the New York meeting is answered by one person of a certain standing. Some have belonged to a Nucleus there, and others who I feel should learn how to answer and are willing to try. Every other week such a person is there, and every other week—at the different ... at a weekly interval—I answer. In that way I try to keep the Group itself to a certain level, and each meeting which is answered by someone else I listen to and I make it a point to try to answer them—or such a person—in the way I feel that Work should be discussed. It is working out quite well, I think. It's a very difficult thing sometimes to spare the time and to have the willingness not to be slipshod, to really be scientific in that sense, to see that we keep different things clear, and together, and that we use language which is necessary for a further understanding and on which then subsequent discussions can be based. It is logical that such things are a little more concentrated in me, because I have that responsibility.

So, that is what I would like to do as far as San Francisco is concerned, and also with

Sebastopol. Sebastopol is a little different because it's so-called Group 'II.' It also will apply to Berkeley. We will be very careful trying to help you. I say again, I hope you don't object to it.

As far as the organization here is concerned, we are working together. The cooperation of the different activities now—the women's Group; Movements; here at the Land: attendance, working on several projects at the present time—I think you have quite a bit of work ahead of you. It does require a great deal of cooperation, and we've talked enough about what I feel should be a necessity of seeing that cooperation is really quite essential. We will never be a Group unless there is a common aim and that you are willing to work for it and, when we work for that aim, that because of that we will be able to Work better for ourselves.

So tomorrow I'll be on my way. I would like to drink to that kind of an effort. Drink only when you wish to help, when you feel that you want to be sincere about it. I have no objection if you don't drink if you have any kind of a feeling that perhaps it would be too difficult, or knowing yourself that you feel you are not as yet committed in that way, but when you do drink you drink really in the form of a ... a vow. A vow is not a promise, it's much more. A promise we have among others—our people, other people on this Earth—and we keep it sometimes, sometimes we don't, we excuse it or rationalize. A vow is a matter of life and death. You must honestly wish, when you have a vow, to fulfill it to the best of your ability. If it's possible we work together, we will have a great deal of benefit—both here on the West Coast and in the East Coast. I hope we can do it. [Toast]

And all this is in the name of Gurdjieff. Gurdjieff still stands out as, I call him sometimes, a 'messenger.' I have no idea if he is that. I like to believe it. I look at his life as a very definite example of how a Man can behave and should, and it is a life that of course is quite unusual and, according to ordinary standards, strange. There was in Gurdjieff, without any question, such a kernel of truth, such an essential essence quality that it will ... would come out every once in a while. But not always. There was in Gurdjieff a judgment about how much he was entitled to tell, and his principles were really to leave it to each person who heard about this kind of Work, this part of esoteric knowledge—the description of a method of how to get out of the state of unconsciousness into a different kind of state: growing, you might say, towards a 'Consciousness' as we define it, or 'Conscience,' or ultimately to become a 'Man'—that Gurdjieff gave the indication where we should go, how we should start.

Very little description of what would be accomplished. Ninety percent of the descriptions

is really related to conditions on Earth and how humanity is—with, of course, some indication of why they happen to be that way. And in general because they happen to live on this Earth and that their particular life was ‘unconscious’ as we call it—unconscious, meaning that there would be a possibility of Consciousness if we knew how to change from one level to another. And whatever then Gurdjieff tried to indicate as a reason for the existence of the universe and the creation in the form of Cosmic Rays—or that what was meant by the Sun Absolute, or even the question of subjectivity of time so that even God himself was subject exactly to that same kind of a rule as Heropass—always Gurdjieff had in mind that he wanted to clarify the issue by first stating what was meant. Not so much how he happened to be that way—although there are indications of a relationship of Man towards the Earth and the function of Organic Kingdom, all of that in relation to what is a Cosmic Ray—but the emphasis was always if one understands the way one is, that what is unconscious and mechanical and automatic, that that state for a Man is not justifiable; that it can be explained because he happens to be on Earth, but that there must be a reason when he is born on Earth: that then there is something else that could exist if he only—any one Man—could understand that there is a difference between a life force and a manifestation of such life, so that then the question of the totality of life constantly comes to the foreground, and that then the puny little Earth happens to be just a little place where there are some people who happen to live there, also representing life. Sometimes that life as far as animals are concerned—or plants, or whatever is the constant movement of everything in this universe existing and for what reason that may have been—that also together with that realization there should be a desire on the part of some—and perhaps as many as possible—to understand that they would have a responsibility to understand their life; and then seeing that it was bound, that then the responsibility would extend in trying to free it and perhaps ultimately, as life itself without a form, to fuse together with the totality of all life existing everywhere and always, and thereby gaining a position of the triunity of the Omni-concepts.

But if Gurdjieff also gave indications here and there that he did know about existences—in the first place of other planets, and *on* other planets—that there were descriptions like, as I’ve said sometimes, Mars, where there is a certain state, a state of Being emotionally expressed with the wish of wanting to find out what was a responsibility for Mars when such people who were there looked down and looked out on this Earth and wished to help. That there was a description of Saturn and the Gornahoor Harharkh episode—electricity.

Many times when electricity is mentioned it is really in connection with the totality of electric power, sometimes electromagnetic, which exists in certain forms, sometimes compared to molecules and atoms and ions or protons or electrons; and very definitely that that what existed and what sometimes is called by Gurdjieff 'Magnetic Center' had a certain quality of that kind of magnetism on account of which the different particles existing in this universe—of which the Earth is one—were functioning in accordance with very definite rules of intelligence, and that it was up to each person, considering his own life, trying to find out why he was the way he was, and in the solution of that problem he would start to understand more and more about the condition of the universe as a whole. That that in that way, by the means of studying oneself—and not only becoming acquainted, but by actually of ... in the form of an Awareness coming to certain facts which then became truthful—that this truth would lead him to the concept as a presence and actually, in the end, the possible fusion with God himself as the All-wise Father, or that what was His Endlessness.

And that is the beauty of Gurdjieff: That he never lost himself in description of Heaven or what would be Hereafter, but that he kept constantly his feet on the ground and simply said that if you wish to Work you will be able to develop and then you will see what can happen to you in an understanding of your own life: how it is to become gradually more and more spiritual, of what is needed for the formation of any kind of a vehicle which will continue to exist and is not subject to the laws of destruction of this Earth; so that then the step-wise change and diagram, you might say, which indicates a constant growth up the rungs of a ladder, finally would lead to a complete understanding of a perfect Man, as far as this Earth is concerned, in three definite states. That is, that it will give a Man, when he is asleep physically, the possibility when he wakes up he can wake up really twice; one is out of the state of a semi-awakened consciousness into what is called 'self-Consciousness,' and that then in fully preparing himself to be able to lose even his name for the sake of life existing without a form, he could reach a state of Cosmic Consciousness.

Now, whatever is possible for a Man on this Earth to reach, there is enough indication of giving a kind of an aim which will help a Man to wish to strive towards it, without telling what he can expect; and all the time telling that if he only wants to Work he will find out, at the time of his further development, what is then available ... available at that level. Gurdjieff never lost himself in descriptions, than only to indicate of that what may be a way of living at a higher

level, without disclosing then what he would see. And there is nev ... nowhere any description of what a Conscientious and Conscious Man is; it is an aim only, and many times it was based on some negation of that what Man is now, or the elimination of different obstacles which are inherent in an unconscious state.

And that is why I feel that Gurdjieff is really quite unique. Because he doesn't stop simply in stating how bad the situation is. He gives a light ... an indication as a light of the direction, he also indicates how the force can be marshaled—that is, how it can be used—for the purpose, first to separate form from life as a current or as a force, and in the second place to give a description of an emotional state which is different, of course, from a physical one but which is the next step after one loses the bondage of the physical.

I see in Gurdjieff many times such indications of knowledge which gradually become more and more confirmed, partly by scientific investigations and partly by spiritual developments and things ... and you might say description of a life of a certain kind or, I've mentioned several times, out-of-body experiences, mediumship, contact with a spiritual world; whatever it may be, Gurdjieff I feel is quite ahead of all of them because he keeps his feet on the ground, and he tells you what to do when you want to walk on this Earth and at the same time try to become Conscious.

I want to say that, because you're liable—I've said it before in Warwick—you are liable to be influenced by a variety of different indications from different people which will sell you or tell you about certain things where it is a little easier than Work on oneself, that then that kind of interest in such directions might make you sometimes believe that it is just as well to have a little enjoyment in your mind, or a little bit of something in your feeling that also you can enjoy, and that it is really not necessary to Work.

I warn about that, because I have quite definitely the feeling that unless you Work out of a subjective state into an Objective one—and it means Work because there is bondage expressed by the subjectivity—unless you do that, all interest in so-called 'spiritual' values and descriptions of the life Hereafter and what I say what is Heaven and so forth, is not going to help you. It is of interest. It is intriguing. I'm not, of course, against it. I'm not against any of such little things that are still in existence. I've mentioned many times folklore, several mythological ideas existing, let's say in the Norse philosophy, North mythology in the Niebelungen and whatever there is in the Middle Ages; all such things which still exist, sometimes still remnants like the

tarot cards, like the I-Ching, like different studies including astrology, including real cosmology, including science at certain times, including a great many other things of interest where there is a little touching of that what is esoteric knowledge—Blavatsky and the secret doctrine, Theosophy in general, the different statements of Nirvana, Buddhism, whatever there is of Zen philosophy that you can understand—all of that is, I say, to the good, but always try to see what kind of indications are given of what to do tomorrow morning when you get up. How your day will start. What you have to do to prepare for a day which we call a ‘good’ day; where there is a possibility of seeing yourself as you are, with your ambitions and with your ... the remnants of your sleep, that at such a time you come to yourself and you thank God for your existence, because you have then the means by which you can start the day in Working. And Working during the day at any one time, and not having to wait until you read a little bit out of a book, and not having to wait until Sunday comes around or waiting for some minister to tell you, but that you all the time have your own laboratory with you.

You carry it with you. It never leaves you as long as you keep on breathing, and so there is no excuse even that when you wish to Work that you have forgotten your tools and you may have to go back to get them. Your body is always there. Your thoughts and your feelings are there. Those are the tools we Work with, and that is what has to be kept in mind: how simple it really is that every time you can play the music of yourself on the instrument you have. You don’t even need a piano or a violin. That is the laboratory. It has not even any glassware in it. It definitely doesn’t have any particular microscope or any kind of chemical ‘machinery,’ I call it. No, it’s a simple human being who happens to wake up in the morning and finds himself still asleep and then makes an attempt to Wake Up in a double sense.

But maybe it’s enough of an introduction. Now perhaps you want to ask some questions.

Nancy Farah: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

Nancy Farah: It’s Nancy Farah.

Mr. Nyland: Huh?

Nancy: It’s Nancy Farah.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, Nancy.

Nancy: Um, I haven’t spoken at a meeting in about a year, and then ... and when ... um, I have been trying to Work, but when I remember to Work my ordinary mind starts thinking of what I

can say at the next meeting that I go to. I would like to speak, but it was affecting my Work attempts, and so I decided, “Well, I’m not going to go think of speaking anymore, I’m just going to concentrate on Work.” And it’s sort of like a vicious circle it. Um, it still happens. I try to make an attempt, and then even if I don’t want to, my mind thinks “Well, I can say this when I go to the meeting,” and it’s just, uh, I don’t know what to do.

Mr. Nyland: Why are you really hesitating. Why don’t you say—at least, let’s say for six months—“I’m not going to talk at the meeting.”

Nancy: I did that, but my mind would still ... I guess I didn’t convince it.

Mr. Nyland: Then you have to convince your mind that you can change it, and you say “Now, for three months I’m going to talk at every meeting.”

Nancy: I’ve thought of that.

Mr. Nyland: Well, your mind is pretty good. But now, let’s do it. Whenever the mind is clever, always try to be a little bit more clever. You do that by anticipating what the mind is going to say, so that the answer is already right there when the mind speaks up.

You understand that, Nancy.

Nancy: I think so.

Mr. Nyland: You know, something in you has to be more clever. When your mind finds all kind of excuses and is rationalizing from top to toe, you were ... you will ... of course you know that the mind is like that. You can anticipate it, even. Will you, when your mind is in a good state; and I call the mind then a perfect ‘example’ of the outside world because the mind, in that state that I mean, is definitely unconscious, it has to do with an outside appearance of myself when I speak, it has to do with an unconscious state of my own and I have no particular reason to believe that it should function differently, because it’s quite useful for the purpose I now want to use it for—I’ve said it before, I now consider this mind to be talkative and I let every thought that comes into the mind talk itself out; I have, now, an imaginary conversation of that mind as it is and something that I call a mind within my inner life.

Sometimes it is nice to imagine that if there is a certain quality of a Kesdjian body already existing, that that also has perhaps something that could function like a little intellect; very feebly, but at the same time of a certain quality because I can imagine that my inner life, if it is alive ... and it may even at that time be in a different kind of a form—which most likely it is—sometimes in a form which I do not recognize as a form of matter, nevertheless existing. For

instance, I classify it under my ... under the attributes of my inner life—intuition; I also definitely know that my inner life is connected with a feeling of a certain kind, and I want that feeling for instance to be sufficiently, uh, Aware of itself existing that it could say to me that it exists and then it would use such words to bring that to my notice.

The imaginary conversation I have is between my inner life and my outer world. It is an inner-Man question wishing then to communicate to the outside world, and using his mind for the purposes of reporting about himself. Now, this mind starts to report about the variety of the different events of the day, and the imaginary conversation takes place at the end of the day. I see what my particular body has done and how I have lived, and my mind has an opinion about it. The conversation now is between this mind saying what it has seen, to some extent even putting a valuation on it, and my inner life wanting to explain to myself that perhaps the ordinary mind has forgotten certain principles.

I would start the classification of that what is my behavior form into two different kinds: One is really a superficial behavior, and the other would be an essential one. Of course my inner life would stick up for the essential, my ordinary mind would say that the superficial one is also quite right. There is something in a person which is a judge about that kind of a conversation. It is the beginning of one's Conscience when you wish to have that conversation and then have a certain judgment about the value of one statement or the other. The advantage of this kind of a little practice is that your mind becomes quite satisfied because it can say anything it wishes; but unfortunately for it, it is connected with something that sits more or less in judgment—or at least is like a good lawyer trying to present a case to the court—and in this, when the court is there, the judge will be your Magnetic Center.

Try to see it that way, Nancy. You will become much more convinced about what you have to do and then, as I say, doing it.

All right?

Nancy Farah: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Nyland: Okay.

Yah.

Calvin Stead: Calvin Stead?

Mr. Nyland: Who?

Calvin: Calvin Stead.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, Calvin. Yah.

Calvin: Uh, today ... today while I was Working ... um, my ... we were just talking about the inner and outer mind—the inner and outer mind that you were just discussing...

Mr. Nyland: Ah, but you must listen better. I didn't say inner and outer 'mind.' I said the outer mind and inner life.

All right. What did I say.

Calvin: Outer mind and inner life. Well, this outer mind seems...

Mr. Nyland: Is that a new idea?

Calvin: No, but I'm ... this ... the inner life is what I want to be to...

Mr. Nyland: I think it's right, Calvin: You want your inner life, you want that world to develop. But you would like your ordinary mind to help you a little bit, because the inner life itself is really very little developed. It has a potentiality, it has a chance, but it is not sufficiently exposed as yet to impressions. When I say it belongs to an 'essential' level, if I wish to develop my inner life I try to become more essential in the variety of my expressions. The kinds of words I would use and the emphasis I place on them should become more essential, more real, more meaningful. My feelings should also change; they should become deeper, and they should include consideration of forms of life which is not only myself. And as far as my ... as far as my physical behavior is concerned, I would like to learn certain postures that belong to an essential Being.

One of them is the constancy of wanting to say certain things in a manner which is more becoming to me, and which I can maintain. The question of your inner life being expressed in your words is important, and for that I have asked you: Can you tell a story to a little child by making that what you are saying continuous, sufficiently enunciating and, if you can, loud enough that it is heard; and then it has the quality of being acceptable to a child which in many ways is much more essential than we are. Try to do that, Calvin.

All right?

Calvin: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: I'm glad you speak, you see, because at the time I suggested for you not to speak at all for about three months, wasn't it? You remember?

Calvin: Yes, I do.

Mr. Nyland: All right. In any event, you will let me know.

Bob Bowman: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Bob Bowman: It's Bob Bowman.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, Bob.

Bob Bowman: I was listening to a tape in which you described the three methods of Work: ABC, the emotional way, and the use of Draining and Sensing. And the question came to my mind, and it's a question I've had for some time, is the place of Sensing particularly and, uh, Draining. Uh, for a long time I have not been using either one consistently because I felt that there wasn't a need to do it and I felt that when I ... if I had a choice between the time it would take to completely Drain and then completely Sense and do the "I Am" exercise and the "Lord, Have Mercy" exercise, that it ... I felt that it was more valuable for me to make Work attempts; if I were in a state in which I could Work, that would be a state that was simple enough and my conditions would be simple enough. And there is a problem that I get to a point—if I do try and Drain—that I'm in a very relaxed state and it's a state in which I ... I know that I can Work. And it's a question of what is of greater value; is it more important to discipline myself and go through the task of, uh, Draining and Sensing, or is it more important, uh, to strive for at that time, knowing that I can Work, to making an attempt to be Conscious for a moment and to try to continue that.

Mr. Nyland: Good, Bob. We'll talk about that on the other side of the cassette.

side 2 It's interesting that you bring up this question of the third approach, because we talked about it last night. You see, the question of the physical is really connected more with the Sensing than with the Draining. The Draining is a good exercise in order to get the totality of the body in good shape and then it creates a condition much more conducive for Work on oneself in any one of the three, but the Sensing exercise has a very definite value to establish for the physical body something that we call simply a 'sub-center' of one's intellect; and it is with this realization of its own existence that this physical body will be enabled gradually to understand what is the bondage that keeps this body to this Earth, and that it is really the loosening up with the question of 'Si-Do' of the physical body itself that counts in the attempts for wishing to Work on oneself.

For that reason that particular method, although it is important and becomes more important as one continues to Work on oneself, is not a consideration for quite some time in the

beginning of one when one Works, and the emphasis is mostly on the intellectual or emotional, dependent on what kind of type one is. So if I have Sensed or Drained and I am in a good state, I really do not wish to consider the physical aspect, it is over a very long time that even the results of that would be noticed; and I would utilize then the condition in which I am for the purpose of either being, let's say, 'ABC' or a person who considers the 'presence' of an 'I' or God near him or the deepening of his feelings in the direction of an emotional state, I think it's far more important. But if you wish, listen to last night's tape, it might give you a little bit different slant or an aspect of it.

All right?

Bob Bowman: Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Keith Johnson: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah

Keith: Keith Johnson.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Keith: I'd like to describe attempts that I made last night. After supper I went out for a walk, by myself walking up a path. As I was walking I said out loud, "I." At the moment when I said that, there was a very clear registration of ... of my aliveness. I ... after that I tried to continue making attempts in order to create such an experience again. I tried to slow down and be very sensitive and open to the possibility of an Objective faculty or an Objective presence, something greater than myself that could be there. Uh, I continued in that way. I was not able to have an experience similar to the first one, but I think that I've noticed about myself in my attempts for Work there seems to be too much of an emphasis on my being sensitive, that often that's all that it is—it's just me being sensitive—and there is not a creation of a higher faculty.

Mr. Nyland: Well, Keith, if the emphasis is on being more sensitive and if there is no creation of 'I', then of course it is not Work at all. In the first place, when I say 'sensitivity' I have a judgment; and sometimes I like to be sensitive, but whatever it is it's a description of my state.

The requirement of 'I' is that it functions Impartially, and you haven't mentioned anything of that. You see, it's not just even the creation of an 'I'. It has to start to Work. And the Working, we call that it will 'Observe' me and that that whole process is a process of Awareness, by which I mean that it is not a mental process like thinking; that it gives information about me,

and that such facts which are then recorded are Impartial facts, truthful facts, absolute facts, facts without any further questioning, and that they also have to be received at a certain time when a actuality of that kind of happening takes place and the recording is at *that* time—that moment. Now, unless there is some indication in your description—or, of your experience as you have had it—of any one of those, you might call it three different ‘necessities’; if there is one it may lead to another, but if there is none of the three it remains just a consideration of your ordinary life nice as it may be and descriptive and also maybe sensitive, but it is not Objective at all.

Work means I have to reach a state of Objectivity from the state where I am now, which is subjective, and for that reason I have to do away with all kinds of subjectivity, particularly when they affect me in collecting facts and data. And if I use my ordinary thought processes, there is very great chance that whatever there is recorded as a fact of myself is already interfered with by the way I feel about it. And at the same time, the recording with an ordinary mind of the fact of myself are subject to a certain time-length between that what actually takes place and the recording of it in my mind. In that particular process, when there is that time-length there is a possibility of the introduction of something that has to do with time itself; which means also that it is either in anticipation of that what is happening or just a recording in memory, in which particular little bit of time-length there is a chance that my thoughts are connected with that what is recorded in my ordinary mind as a fact. And because of that, the introduction of anything that has to do with associative values, anything that has to do with a rationalization or justifications, always will give a slant to a fact and make it not as truthful. As a matter of fact, it will lose its truth because it becomes a personal interpretation.

I think you have to think about this a little bit more, Keith, because Work is only worthwhile when one does it right. And if there is just a little semblance of an indication that perhaps, and so forth—maybe perhaps ‘tomorrow,’ like Gurdjieff would say—it is of no value at all. It is a general discussion, you may as well go to an encounter group.

We’re interested in the obtaining of certain facts which are absolute, above par, not at all to be further interpreted. And why; because it’s the only basis on which something can be built. Anything that is not that way and is therefore subjectively tinted, is going to die. It will be destroyed because of its subjectivity, you might say, ‘mixed’ with it, and therefore when I die that will die, my foundation will die, the Kesdjanian body will start to tumble down. That’s the reason. I want something absolute in order to reach a region where absolute is King—or even

common sense. Not here, where absoluteness practically never exists.

I hope you understand it, Keith. I'm sure you know what I'm talking about.

Keith: Yes, I do.

Mr. Nyland: All right. Then when you report or when you describe any kind of experience, first see for yourself if that what you consider a result, or what is worthwhile describing, is answering to the requirements which are involved in the Work, in Work as Partkdolg Duty.

All right?

Keith: Truly, Mr. Nyland.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Keith: Thank you. I'm ... I'm certain this experience was Objective in being ... in being a registration that something else of my ordinary personality felt the fact that I exist.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, that I believe—that there is sometimes something very unusual. It does not make it Objective. For instance, in my emotional state I can have a flash of an insight which is very deeply down; that is, it may be quite unusual for me because I don't live that deep so often, and because of either the newness or the unexpectancy or that what actually is taking place as that what I've never had before—all of that in connection with an attempt of Work will make me believe that that is really a result of Work or that it is Work in principle. And that is why I warn about it. Because such things that then become quite pure, even intellectually or emotionally, are not as yet Objective.

Objectivity is a field which is above the line separating subjectivity from Objectivity. I sometimes live, in the subjective world, very close to that line—that borderline—but unless I go over it I do not get the Objectivity, although when I'm close to the line I may even smell the fragrance of the possibility of that what is Objective. Moses never got into the Holy Land. But he had a flavor of it when he went up the Mount Nebo and looked and saw the Holy Land. That was as far as he got, but the Lord did not give him the satisfaction of entering into the Holy Land, for whatever reason that was. There are many instances when we receive, as a result of perhaps accidental happenings, certain things in this life which have a coloration as if they are of Heaven, but when one really considers them and tries to analyze them they don't have any heavenly quality in them because they are not Objective enough. It's either, with such things, "Yes" or "No." It still remains dark when there is not light. Although when there is a little light of ray ... a ray of light entering into darkness, then I will consider it already light—because there

is a positive value to light and there is a negative value to darkness.

Try to distinguish. It's not that I want to tell you not to have beautiful thoughts and lovely feelings or even be sensitive. It's wonderful to be that way, but we are talking about the formation of a Soul, which is not of this Earth.

Keith: Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: All right.

Terry Bloch: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Terry: It's Terry Bloch.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Terry: My Work today was like this. I said ... um, your answer to Judy last night was ... seemed quite clear to me, and so today I said when I let 'I' Observe me I ... I would say that in my mind and I would walk or do a physical movement, but I know that it was really more like just plain ordinary me was concentrating a little more, and I know it's not on the right plane. What can I do next? How can I go...

Mr. Nyland: There are really ... there are really two things you could do. Continuation of what you are doing until you finally come to a conclusion that that what is being Observed is really Impartial, because one becomes so acquainted with what one is seeing that there is no further desire either to describe it or to wish it to be different. That is a very long process, but it does take place in ordinary life and then ends up in what we call 'maturity.'

The other way is to introduce an element that functions as a catalyzer in this particular process of Observation. It has to be then that it already has a quality of being able to see what is life as distinguished from a form; and although we remain constantly in contact with the forms as they are, at certain times such a form can become transparent and I see actually what makes it alive, and the realization of that life with that what we call 'I', and which many times we have described as a form of light within a container. That is, that what is 'I' for one is a creation of that what I wish this 'I' to be in, the creation is my own as a certain form. I call it a 'container.' That what is the content I wish there for the sake of myself recognizing my own life, and I wish life to be in there as given from a higher level of Being. When that takes place, now, and this 'I' you might say is now 'functioning,' it gives then an Impartial idea of what I am as a human being. Because that what is Observed is my life force, the result of that is that if I can continue

with that kind of a process I will see more and more this life in the transparency of the form. But the continuation of the existence of 'I' and the continuation of the Observation process will give me the form of ... in which life is represented. Because, I cannot do away with the form. All I wish is first to recognize the life within; and then I see that that life is expressed in that form, and the more I now can make this process continuous the more truthful experience there is, even within my mind. I become, with other words, more acquainted with myself in a shorter time, because that process of Observation is catalytically influenced by the ... the concept of Objectivity.

Is that clear?

Terry: I'll have to listen to it again.

Mr. Nyland: [chuckle] Yah. But you see, keep on Working that way. Keep on trying to see what it is—what is really meant by an 'I' as Objectivity, as a faculty—and keep on making attempts, which sometimes may be a little bit more truthful than at other times. But it is a process that one has to learn really gradually, because this 'I' is not full-grown overnight. It takes a very long time to build up something that is really Conscious in an atmosphere of unconsciousness. The only trouble is that I don't want to admit that that is an unconscious atmosphere. I always have belief that my mind is clear enough to be able to see the truth, and as long as I have belief in that I will have a great difficulty in understanding what is really a Conscious mind.

But keep on trying and keep on trying to do your best that way, and not looking for immediate results. You will become more and more acquainted with yourself as you are, and every once in a while in ordinary life while you are busy with whatever it may be, you will have flashes in such moments of the recognition of yourself.

All right, Terry.

Terry: All right.

Dave Farah: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Dave: Dave Farah.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Dave: I wonder if you can help me with the question of friction.

Mr. Nyland: The question of what?

Dave: Friction.

Mr. Nyland: Friction. Yah. Didn't you bring that up already?

Dave: No.

Mr. Nyland: Not yet.

Dave: You must be reading my thoughts. I want to find out how to use it, Mr. Nyland, because very often I have...

Mr. Nyland: David, it is very good to use it if there is enough of it, but not too much. If there is too much it is like an avalanche, you are covered by it and there is no chance at all to make any attempt for Work. It is a pity, because when there is good friction there is a tremendous amount of energy; and I say it's a pity that it goes by the board, but if you want to learn how to use a little bit, a little bit of friction is like a little bit of salt: It makes food palatable. As soon as there is too much salt, it becomes poisonous. If of course there is no salt, the dinner—or whatever it is—is saltless and you don't want to eat it. Friction is very good for that purpose—within measure. You create it by acting on certain conditions where there is ... you have a knowledge already that it will cause friction: that there is something that either for yourself you do and goes against the grain where it will require more difficulty, or when you happen to meet with someone with whom you perhaps even have had an argument. So you ... you have a selection. You can actually meet friction in the quantity that you think you can manage. When you are overrun by it you have misjudged your capacity of handling it, and next time you select a little less quantity of friction.

But it is a very useful way of trying to Work. The little bit of energy that is available and the reason why one goes 'against,' I say, 'the grain' which causes the friction, is exactly that you want to extract, because of that energy, something that reminds you of Work. And then seeing yourself as you are, even if there is a description possible as a result of the friction, the reason why you want to Work then is that you have created the friction for that purpose and therefore you're not looking at the friction in an ordinary way. With other words, it does not cause you to be angry. It makes you very helpful—to see what energy there is for the purpose you've set out with; that is, that you wish to use it for Work on yourself.

That is an intentional friction. When there is a friction which happens without even your knowledge but that all of a sudden comes, you're usually too late to use it, and don't try it. It is there, it's gone. The damage is done. You're sorry; you look at it afterwards but the friction

already has had its bad effect, and it is not a good time to Work.

Dave: Very good. Thank you, Mr. Nyland.

Mr. Nyland: All right. I wish there was a little store somewhere where I could buy one ounce of friction. [laughter]

David Differding: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah

David: This is David.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, David.

David: Um, I'm perplexed about a question having to do with a perspective of Work. Um, I find that no matter how good my intentions, I always Work less than I would like, and I don't know how to place that. Sometimes I feel that it's just my own weakness and childishness and that it's really completely up to me to do something about it and that I just have to do it, and...

Mr. Nyland: David, as long as you keep on calling it 'childishness' or 'weakness,' you will never be able to use it. It is an acceptance of the state in which you are, and which you are ... have to be quite accurate about what you can do and cannot do. Those are the statements of truth. If you find that you are doing less than you would wish, your statement is "This is what I am," and my wish doesn't mean anything at all.

We've talked sometimes about the word 'should,' and that it should be changed into I 'wished I could,' which is quite different. As soon as I say that I am at fault I already have a judgment, and at that time I cannot be Impartial. But if I can accept myself for whatever it is, at whatever level it happens to be and at whatever state of weakness it happens to be, I'd much rather be truthful about my state as it is instead of wishing for something else, or even interpreting it into something that is not in existence.

Stop calling it 'childish' or whatever it is—weakness. You say, "That is me." "That is me"—almost I would say I would become proud of it in saying it, but that is just as bad because then you are not Impartial either. But I would make a statement: "I Am." At such a time I really mean this "I-Am"ness in the sense that whatever I wish as "I" I wish to exist, but whatever there is as "Am" is Amness, is Being.

David, I'll give you something to do. At such a time look in your hand—left and right. There is an 'M' in one and there is an 'M' in the other. What it means, of course, you know: Memento Mori—remember that you will die. I use it many times to indicate that I exist, and I

say that is my “Am.” Fortunately in the English language I can use it that way; then I am reminded of my existence and the acceptance which is necessary for that whatever there is as me, and then I’m free for that one moment, at that moment even I can Work.

I think it will help you.

David: Thank you.

Bob Bowman: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Bob: Bob Bowman. I have another question, this time relating to ordinary acceptance of what I am on the basis of alertness and facts gathered by my ordinary mind, things about which ... about myself which I’m not pleased about at first, in fact I would like to rationalize it away. But somehow later I gain perspective on that behavior and ... and in one case was almost reduced to a very humble state, and I gained an insight into my previous behavior that made it possible for me to accept myself and say, “Yes, that’s the way I am in certain instances, and that will help my motivation to want to Work on myself.” Because I realize the only solution is that I must become full grown and have an ‘I’ that functions, and that type of acceptance seems quite different from the other kind of acceptance where I have a registration of the fact that I exist and I know that it’s absolute fact about myself in that there is no rationalization. And I wondered if you could, uh, comment on the difference between the two.

Mr. Nyland: The one which you talk about as being different from the ordinary one of the acceptance of a fact, is of course the extension of the fact in a form of life; so that then the acceptance has to include the form of your behavior—of which there is, of course, a description every once in a while—and it is that process of rationalizing that you are referring to, quite logically that acceptance has to extend also in your behavior not only as a fact of existence—that’s fairly easy because there is no particular reason in a moment to have even a judgment—but I have a judgment about myself when I behave in a certain way and sometimes, afterwards in thinking about it, I may be either a little ashamed or as you say, ‘humble.’

It is a question of how much can I still accept as I see this process go on, and it becomes extremely difficult because my mind will start to interpret it in a certain way so that I can live with that. You see what is required: The mind in itself is only one function and it happens to be perhaps one third of oneself, but when I wish to accept myself it has to be not only the mind; it has to be a feeling and it has to be almost, I would say, in a posture. That is, that what is the fact

of wishing to accept myself as I am, now either as a fact or as a continuation of a fact in an activity, has to become part of my Being. That is why I mentioned to David it is that Being that really counts. “I Am,” and that “Am”ness is that what makes it so complete for me that there is no further question about accepting myself. It has to reach that level as a result of the impressions of three centers becoming One, and it is not easy because on the road of that kind of a combination of fusion of the three to come to the real conclusion which is the level of my Being where it takes place, there is all the chance in the world that my mind or my feeling is going to gnaw at it and going to nibble, nibble it away so that when finally the truth so-called ‘lands up’ on the level of my Being, it is really not much of ... just a little bit of a semblance of that what used to be. Really, the fact of absoluteness, when it has to go through all the different channels of my personality, is liable to get torn to pieces.

Bob: I guess the question is that often in the absence of a lot of data of significant ... what I would call ‘significant’ data about ways that I manifest, in a lack of that I do have a great deal of alertness, data gathered by alertness and data even that is very subjective that, um... For instance, in a couple of instances where I expressed anger in a very, uh, strong ... a more than usual strong way, that it ... I actually ... something was horrified by that.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, but that’s really ordinary life. Bob, don’t try it in such conditions.

Bob: But I wasn’t trying to Work now, but the point was...

Mr. Nyland: No. Then it’s only a statement that you see that of yourself, which is connected with Work if you wished that you could have been Observant of it. Because as soon as you introduce the idea of ... of wanting to accept it, you already talk about Work. In ordinary life you don’t accept yourself. You rationalize it away. And I say, “Don’t try to Work then.” It is a state in which you are, but it is impossible to introduce any kind of Objectivity.

Bob: I guess the acceptance of that kind of behavior, uh, as ... well, I have to admit that I was that way in that particular situation ... comes when I am in a different state, when I am in a more, um, calm and perhaps in a better state of equilibrium.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, that’s a state of contemplation about the past. It still isn’t Work.

Bob: I ... I realize that, but this ... this is helpful for me to be in that state, because I ... I don’t fight, I don’t try to rationalize it.

Mr. Nyland: Okay, I ... I agree it is helpful to be in that state. And if it is helpful, then Work then. Never mind what used to be or what has produced it, you are now in a state in which you

say you're ... it's helpful—where you are quiet peaceful and so forth, more poised—*then* Work. Don't think about the past, when you might have Worked.

Bob: Yes I, I...

Mr. Nyland: You understand what I mean.

Bob: ...I actually do that.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. Because it is lost time and lost energy. It is sometimes useful to derive a stimulus from it, particularly when perhaps thinking about it produces a state of equilibrium in which you can contemplate of what you have been without getting again angry about whatever might have happened. But, you see, it is still an unconscious and sometimes lovely state, but it doesn't buy any, as I say, it doesn't buy any bread in Heaven.

Bob: Yes, I understand that.

Mr. Nyland: It has not that quality. When I want to Work, I Work for a long time in such simple conditions—like ordinary sitting in a chair and getting up and moving my head and this and that—all the time trying to be Awake, or something is Awake to me, in whatever activity I do in which I'm not at all involved, just happens to be. I mentioned several times, the habit which I bring to the foreground simply indicates that my mind was not functioning at all, but at the same time I happen to exist; and that is my body, and then I wish that there was an 'I' at that time seeing that what is me, and the acceptance of that.

All right. You understand what I mean, I'm sure. [buzzer]

Bob: Yes I do. Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: And that is our dear instrument. So, it makes me shut up. And maybe very good huh? Now you're on your own again. All that I am is a little memory until I come again and maybe I can step on your toes. If I've done it it was quite unintentional, and if you wish and you feel that way, you come to Warwick, I put my foot out of the door and you can step on it.

Goodnight, everybody. Take care of yourself. Try to Work. Keep at it and remain honest. Goodnight.

End of tape